UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,582	08/30/2001	Marina Libman	003636.0067	6396

7590 01/31/2007

MANELLI, DENSION & SELLER PLLC
ATTN: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN
2000 M ST., N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20016

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/941,582	LIBMAN, MARINA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9-14,21-25,39-46 and 51-58* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,15-20,26-38 and 47-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-8, 15-20, 26-31, 32-38, 47-50 are pending.

Claims 9-14, 21-25, 39-46, 51-58 are non-elected and must be cancelled in view of restriction requirement.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/06 have been considered and are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant has selected group I, claims 1-8, 15-20, 26-31, 32-38, 47-50 with traverse.

Applicant is reminded that to traverse this requirement on the grounds that the groups are not patentably distinct, applicant should present evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the groups to be obvious variations of one another. If the groups are determined not to be patentably distinct and they remain in this application, any rejection of one group over prior art will apply equally to all other embodiments. See Ex parte Appeal No. 315-40, 152 USPQ 71 (Bd. App. 1965). No argument asserting patentability based on the differences between the groups will be considered once the groups have been determined to comprise a single inventive concept.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 47 recites "a computer readable medium storage medium on which is embedded one or more computer programs" is drawn to the non-statutory subject matter. The computer programs are software which is embodied on a computer readable medium. However, the computer readable medium is intrinsically interpreted through the specification para 107 to include signals. Signals are not embodied and further defined as modulated on a carrier wave another aspect unpatentable material.

Claims 1-8 and 15-20 are statutory subject matter as being drawn to a method which is interpreted as a process.

Claims 26-31 and 32-38 are drawn to statutory subject matter as a machine that performs the steps of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 6 recites "providing a plurality of selectable storage locations..." The specification fails to

teach 'locations' or 'plurality' of locations. The specification teaches user specifying or a predetermined location but not the plural.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6, 27, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites "providing a plurality of selectable storage locations..." The specification fails to teach 'locations' or 'plurality' of locations. The specification teaches user specifying or a predetermined location but not the plural.

Claim 27 recites "the source device for synchronizing an instant message history" in the preamble. There is a lack of antecedent basis for instant message history as it is not taught in claim 26. The examiner believes applicant means instant message and that instant message history claims were drawn to subject matter not elected to pursue by way of restriction/election and would also be restricted out as well.

Claim 32 recites "..to accept said message history.." in the third limitation of the claim. There is a lack of antecedent basis for said message history as it is not taught in claim 32. The examiner believes applicant means instant message and that instant message history claims were drawn to subject matter not elected to pursue by way of restriction/election and would also be restricted out as well.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification fails to teach 'locations' or 'plurality' of locations. The specification teaches user specifying or a predetermined location but not the plural.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille.

Regarding claim 1, the Mache reference teaches a method for transferring data between a data source and a data sink (Mache: page 1, para 2), comprising:

initiating a transfer of an instant message having a first data format compatible with a first instant messaging system (Mache: page 2, para 34);

transferring said instant message in response to an establishment of a communication channel (Mache: page 2, para 42);

converting a received instant message to a previously selected second data format compatible with a second instant messaging system (Mache: page 4, para 115).

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches storing chat messages in a previously selected location (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 4, the method for transferring data according to claim 1, wherein said transferring further comprises:

activating a destination synchronization module in response to the establishment of said communication channel (Mache: page 3, para 57; gateways); and

transferring said data in response to said activation of said destination synchronization module (Mache: page 4, para 103).

Regarding claim 5, the method for transferring data according to claim 1, wherein said converting further comprises:

providing a plurality of selectable data formats that said first data format and said second data format are selected from (Mache: page 4, para 103-115).

Regarding claim 7, the method for transferring data according to claim 1, further comprising:

establishing said communication channel over a wireless network (Mache: page 4, para 104-105).

Regarding claim 8, the method for transferring data according to claim 1, further comprising:

establishing said communication channel over a wired network (Mache: page 4, para 106-107).

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020173308 by Dorenbosch et al.

Regarding claim 2, the Mache reference teaches the method for transferring data according to claim 1.

The modified Mache reference fails to teach unavailability after trying to connect.

However, the Dorenbosch reference teaches indicating an unavailability in response to a non-establishment of said communication channel (Dorenbosch: page 2-3, para 25; Fig. 6) in order to let the sender know the message has yet to be deliver (Dorenbosch: page 2-3, para 25).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for transferring data as taught by the modified Mache reference to include indicating unavailability of connectivity as taught by Dorenbosch to let the sender know the message has yet to be deliver (Dorenbosch: page 2-3, para 25).

Regarding claim 3, the Mache reference teaches the method for transferring data according to claim 2.

The modified Mache reference fails to teach a second attempt at connectivity.

However, the Dorenbosch reference teaches providing a second attempt of establishing said communication channel in response to said unavailability (Dorenbosch: page 2-3, para 25; Fig. 6) in order to deliver the message to the intended recipient (Dorenbosch: page 3, para 26).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for transferring data as taught by the modified Mache reference to include indicating unavailability of connectivity as taught by Dorenbosch to deliver the message to recipient (Dorenbosch: page 3, para 26).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020178222 by O'Hara et al.

Regarding claim 6, the modified Mache reference teaches the method for transferring data according to claim 1.

The Mache reference fails to teach storage locations.

However, the O'Hara reference teaches providing a plurality of selectable storage locations for storage of messages (O'Hara: page 1, para 8) in order to be able to locate the relevant message later (O'Hara: page 1, para 8).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of transferring messages as taught by the modified Mache to include saving to user selected locations (O'Hara: page 1, para 8) in order to be able to locate the relevant message later (O'Hara: page 1, para 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al.

Regarding claim 15, a method for synchronizing an instant message (Mache: page 1, para 2), comprising:

initiating a transfer of said instant message in a first data format compatible with a first instant messaging system (Mache: page 2, para 34);

transferring said instant message in response to an establishment of a communication channel in a second data format compatible with a second instant messaging system (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 115); and

determining a destination of said instant message (Mache: page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 18, the method for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 15, further comprising:

attempting to connect to another computing platform in response to said destination being said another computing platform (Mache: page 4, para 115).

Claims 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille.

Regarding claim 16, the Mache reference teaches the method for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 15, further comprising:

converting said instant message to a previously selected said second data format in response to said destination being a current computing platform (Mache: page 4, para 115).

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches storing chat messages in a previously selected location (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 17, the Mache reference teaches the method for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 16.

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches transmitting a completion message in response to completion of said storing (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37) in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

Regarding claim 19, the Mache reference the method for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 18, further comprising:

transferring said instant message in response to an establishment of a communication channel with said destination (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 115);

converting a received instant message to a previously selected said second data format (Mache: page 4, para 115).

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches storing chat messages in a previously selected location (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 20, the Mache reference teaches the method for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 19.

The Machereference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches transmitting a completion message in response to completion of said storing (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37) in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille.

Regarding claim 26, the Mache reference teaches a source device for synchronizing an instant message (Mache: page 2, para 42), comprising:

an interface adapted to communicate with a destination device (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 115);

a processor configured to accept a synchronization request, convert said instant message from a first data format compatible with a first chat system into a second data format compatible with a second chat system and to transfer said instant message from said memory in response to said an establishment of a communication channel through said interface (Mache: page 2, para 34, 42; page 4, para 115).

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches a memory configured to store a message of a messaging program (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 27, the source device for synchronizing an instant message history according to claim 26, wherein said processor is adapted to activate a synchronization module on said destination device and to transfer said instant message in response to an activation of said synchronization module (Mache: page 2, para 42).

Regarding claim 28, the source device for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 27, wherein said synchronization module is adapted to determine a destination for said instant message (Mache: page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 29, the Mache reference teaches the source device for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 28.

The Mache reference fails to teach history,

However, the Maurille reference teaches a synchronization module is further adapted to combine any associated data related to said history into a combined instant message (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 30, the Mache reference teaches the source device for synchronizing an instant message history according to claim 29.

The Mache reference fails to teach history.

However, the Maurille reference teaches a synchronization module is further adapted to transfer said combined instant message to a final destination device in response to said determining of said destination is said final destination device (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 31, the source device for synchronizing an instant message according to claim 28, wherein said synchronization module is further adapted to transfer said instant message to a final destination device in response to said determining of said destination is said final destination device (Mache: page 1, para 8; page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Claims 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille.

Regarding claim 32, a destination device for synchronizing an instant message (Mache: page 2, para 42), comprising:

an interface adapted to communicate with a source device (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 115);

a synchronization module configured to accept said instant message from a source device in response to an activation message from said source device (Mache: page 2, para 34, 42; page 4, para 115); and

a processor configured to establish a communication channel with said source device through said interface in response to a synchronization request at said source device, convert said instant message from a first data format compatible with a first chat system into a second data format compatible with a second chat system and to activate said synchronization module to accept said message history from said source device in response to an activation message from said source device (Mache: page 2, para 34, 42; page 4, para 115).

Regarding claim 33, the destination device according to claim 32, wherein said synchronization module is adapted to determine a destination of said instant message (Mache: page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 34, the destination device according to claim 33, wherein said synchronization module is further adapted to combine any associated data related to said instant message into a combined instant message (Mache: page 4, para 85-101).

Regarding claim 35, the destination device according to claim 34, wherein said synchronization module is further adapted to transfer said combined instant message to a final destination device in response to said determining of said destination is said final destination device (Mache: page 1, para 8; page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 36, the destination device according to claim 33, wherein said synchronization module is further adapted to transfer said instant message to a final destination device in response to said determining of said destination is said final destination device (Mache: page 1, para 8; page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 37, the destination device according to claim 33, wherein said synchronization module is further configured to convert said instant message to said second data format in response to said determining of said destination is said destination device (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 87, 115).

Regarding claim 38, the Mache reference teaches the destination device according to claim 37.

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches a memory configured to store a message of a messaging program (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Claim 47, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al.

Regarding claim 47, a computer readable storage medium on which is embedded one or more computer programs, said one or more computer programs implementing a method of transferring an instant message data, said one or more computer programs comprising a set of instructions for (Mache: page 1, para 1; page 2, para 26):

initiating a transfer of said instant message data (Mache: page 2, para 34);

transferring said instant message data in response to an establishment of a communication channel (Mache: page 2, para 34);

converting said instant message data in a first instant message data format into a second instant message data format, said first instant message data format being compatible with a first instant messaging system and said second instant message data format being compatible with a second instant messaging system (Mache: page 2, para 42; page 4, para 115); and

determining a destination of said said instant message data (Mache: page 3, para 73, 76-79).

Regarding claim 50, the computer readable storage medium according to claim 47, said one or more computer programs further comprising a set of instructions for: attempting to connect to said destination in response to said destination is not a current computing platform (Mache: page 2, para 34, 42; page 4, para 115).

Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No 20010003202 by Mache et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 by Maurille.

Regarding claim 48, the Mache reference teaches the computer readable storage medium according to claim 47, said one or more computer programs further comprising a set of instructions for:

converting said instant message data to a previously selected data format in response to said destination is a current computing platform (Mache: page 2, para 34, 42; page 4, para 115).

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches storing chat messages in a previously selected location (Maurille: col. 3, lines 16-28) in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 2, lines 60-61; col. 3, lines 49-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to display the content and history of all messages with associated chat members (Maurille: col. 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 49, the Mache reference teaches the computer readable storage medium according to claim 47.

The Mache reference fails to teach storing the converted message.

However, the Maurille reference teaches one or more computer programs further comprising a set of instructions for: transmitting a completion message in response to completion of said storing (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37) in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Mache to include storing messages as taught by Maurille in order to confirm and alert of updates to the database (Maurille: col. 16, lines 53 – col. 17, line 8; col. 3, lines 31-37).

Prior Art

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002015000 by Fok teaches converting between a first and second data format in an instant messaging system page 1, para 7, 10-12; page 2, para 25.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007398 by Mendiola et al teaches transferring and converting data between different protocols and formats based on addressee handle and address format, page 1, para 3; page 2, para 15-19, 29, 34; page 3, 44-48.

U.S. Patent No. 6,212,548 by DeSimone et al teaches history and formats of different chat systems and protocols with conversion between conversations, col. 3, lines 48-50; col. 6, lines 1-10; col. 5, lines 35-45.

Remarks

Applicant has selected group one with traverse but has presented no arguments in accordance with traversal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER